

G. Mello Disposal Corp. — Carleton Drive

Comments Report

9 June 2021

LOCATION: Northside terminus of Carleton Drive — Map 15, Lot 46.

ZONING: CC (minimum lot size 80,000 sf/200 ft. frontage)

PURPOSE OF PETITION: Site Plan application, calling for the construction of a 15,000 sf transfer station and ancillary facilities at the terminus of Carleton Drive, abutting to the west of I-95 SB.

SUBMITTED PLAN ENTITLED: Site Plan of land in Georgetown, Massachusetts Off Carleton Drive (Assessor's Map 15, Lot 46), prepared by The Morin-Cameron Group, Inc., dated 9 OCT 19, revised thru _____ and consisting of Sheets C-1 thru C-4, L1 thru L3, D-1 thru D-4 and DS 4.01, 4.02 & 4.03 (said Mello Site Plans and all other data and plans associated with this project can be referenced by clicking-on the following dropbox link:

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ovwnpcav8t13kxx/AABxbnchdq7Si_Mm2TAd8mika?dl=0

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Letter authored by Atty. Nancy McCann, dated 27 MAY 2021, “A”. This letter cites all of the attachments included in the separate attachment included in the E-Packet, labeled: **060921 Mello File**. This file includes: all of the applicant’s traffic review comments, except those involving: **Ron Muller & Associates (RMA) Mello Traffic 2d Peer Review Report, dated 3 JUN 21 – “B”**. Also included in said Mello File are 276 signed letters of support for the project and photos of the proposed development site, as viewed from I-95.

APPLICATION TRACKING:

13 JAN 21 - Initial public hearing scheduled, continued date specific to the 24 MAR 21 meeting.

24 MAR 21 - 2d public hearing and continued date specific to the 28 APR 21 meeting and **Form H executed thru 30 JUN 2021**.

28 APR 21 – 3d public hearing, continued date specific to the 9 JUN 21 meeting.

REQUESTED WAIVERS: N/A

SUGGESTED ACTION: This hearing was continued from the 28 APR 21 meeting, with the hope of concluding the board’s traffic peer review phase of this project’s Site Plan Review. To this effect, in preparation for the meeting, please read RMA’s attached 2d Peer Review Report letter, “B”, together

with all of the traffic related communications included in the attached **Mello File**. Please note, in regard to the results of the core samples taken of Carleton Drive's surface and subsurface, as cited in RMA's report, "**B**", the board can negotiate with the applicant as to whether the complete reconstruction of Carleton Dr. will be required as an offsite improvement. That is, in regard to possible affirmative action by the board for this project, and that a rational nexus appears to have been established by the findings of the core samples and the determination of RMA, as the board's expert peer review traffic consultant. In addition to the foregoing, it appears that all of Mr. Fried's remaining traffic concerns, as cited at the 28 APR 21 hearing, have been addressed by the applicant (see Exhibits "**C**" and "**D**" included in the attached **Mello File**) and confirmed in RMA's above-cited and attached letter "**B**".

NOTE: the Mello File also includes site specific comments, relative to the board's site inspection of the development parcel conducted on Saturday, 8 MAY 21. Please see Exhibits "**B**" and "**E**" included in the **Mello File**.

At the conclusion of Wed night's hearing, the board may want to consider either continuing the hearing or moving to take final action. In regard to the former, the applicant would need to acquiesce to an extension beyond the present 30 JUN 2021 deadline. In regard to the later, and, perhaps, taking into consideration the content of the attached McCann letter, "**A**", if the board does decide to take final action, a written decision would have to be drafted and the board would have to agree to take final action on the written decision at either the 23 JUN 21 meeting or a suitable date prior to 30 JUN 21. To the effect of the foregoing possible choices to decide on Wed. night, DRAFT MOTIONS are provided below for the board's consideration.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

I move to reopen and the public hearing, which was continued date specific from the 28 APR 21 meeting.

Motion: _____ Second: _____ Carried/Failed: _____.

Roll call vote: BF _____, BW: _____ JL: _____ GC: _____ HL: _____

I move to continue the Mello Transfer Station public hearing date specific to the 23 JUN 21 or the _____ JUN 21 Planning Board special meeting.

Motion: _____ Second: _____ Carried/Failed: _____

Roll call vote: BF _____, BW: _____ JL: _____ GC: _____ HL: _____

I move to grant an extension to 30 SEPT 21 concerning the Site Plan Review application of the Mello Transfer Station proposal, located off Carleton Drive.

Motion: _____ Second: _____ Carried/Failed: _____

Roll call vote: BF _____, BW: _____ JL: _____ GC: _____ HL: _____

I move to take final action on the Mello Transfer Station , located on the north side terminus of Carleton Dr. , shown as Lot 46 Map 15, and for this action to consist of :

Motion: _____ Second: _____ Carried/Failed: _____

Roll call vote: BF _____, BW: _____ JL: _____ GC: _____ HL: _____

"A"

MCCANN & MCCANN, P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
89 NEWBURY STREET, SUITE 302
DANVERS, MASSACHUSETTS 01923
TELEPHONE: 978-739-8484
FACSIMILE: 978-739-8455
E-MAIL: NMCCANN@MCCANNLAW.COM

May 27, 2021

Georgetown Planning Board
Town Hall
One Library Street
Georgetown, MA 01833
Attn: John Cashell, Planner

Re: G. Mello Disposal Corp. – Site Plan Approval
Carleton Drive, Georgetown, MA

Dear Board Members:

In anticipation of the our June 9, 2021 Planning Board Meeting relative to the above-reference matter, submitted herewith* in response to comments received during the public hearing please find:

Exhibit A - Response to comments regarding the transfer station within Massachusetts and property value impacts.

Exhibit B – Response to comments relative to dust and odor control see the Operation and Maintenance Plan submitted with the Application Package and re-submitted with this package. In addition as the Board members observed during the recent site view, the proximity to Route 95; the orientation of the building doors toward Route 95; the observation that the closest home is over 1200 feet, approximately a ¼ of a mile, from the building; and the enclosed building operations mitigate the noise from the transfer station operations and protect adjacent properties from nuisance caused by noise.

Exhibit C and D – Response to traffic related comments, also submitted to the Board and the Planning Board's traffic peer review consultant under separate cover by GPI directly. Please note, the core sampling results indicate that Carleton Drive is in need of reconstruction; the Applicant will accept a condition of approval to work with the Town to address the condition of Carleton Drive prior to occupancy.

Exhibit E – Response to comments regarding visibility of transfer station building from Route 95. Landscape Architect Michael Radner has studied the Route 95 corridor views and has prepared graphics of the proposed transfer station building from Route 95. These graphics are a conservative view with

the building shown actually slightly higher than the actual elevation. As the project team has presented to the Board during the hearings, the existing and proposed vegetation, berm, and minimal size and height of the proposed building render the building almost invisible to those traveling on Route 95. The same cannot be said of other industrial and commercial buildings in Georgetown that line the Route 95 corridor.

Also included with this submission please find **276 LETTERS OF SUPPORT** for the proposed G. Mello Disposal Corp. Transfer Station on Carleton Drive submitted by 260 residents of the Town of Georgetown.

The Applicant's team submitted a thorough and complete Site Plan Approval Application package to the Planning Board on October 9, 2019, which included a Summary of Operations and the Operation and Maintenance Plan for the G. Mello Disposal Corporation Solid Waste Handling Facility, Carleton Drive, prepared by Cornerstone Engineering. Subsequent submissions in response to comments and in response to the Planning Board's Civil Engineering Peer Review, and the Planning Board's Traffic Engineer's Peer Review have been submitted throughout the hearing process. The Board has received the final peer review letters from civil peer review engineer Larry Graham, P.E. and traffic peer review engineer Ronald Mueller Associates.

The Applicant submits that: (1) responses have been provided to all of the Board's comments; (2) the purposes of a site plan approval to protect the health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the inhabitants of the Town of Georgetown have been satisfied; and (3) the Site Plan review criteria under Section 165 - 83 have been met, and well exceeded through the detailed information provided by the Applicant and its development team. The Site Plan Application Package with supplemental documentation supports the following:

- (1) The location of buildings, uses and other site development are properly located on the site.
- (2) Adjacent properties are protected from nuisance caused by noise, fumes and glare of lights, and from detracting visual features.
- (3) Unique man-made features, such as stone walls, and significant natural features on a site are preserved as much as possible (i.e., hills, water bodies, wetlands, trees, tree groves, wooded areas, rock outcrops, native plants, wildlife habitats and other areas of aesthetic and ecological interest).
- (4) Adequate parking, loading facilities, drainage and methods of solid waste disposal are provided on-site.
- (5) Pedestrianways, access driveways, loading and parking facilities are properly designed and operated for public convenience and safety.
- (6) To maintain the village-like character of the Town by considering the architectural style and its relation to the prevailing character and scale of buildings in the neighborhood, proposed buildings shall relate harmoniously with the surrounding area.

Georgetown Planning Board
May 27, 2021

(7) Water resources are protected from depletion and contamination, including drinking water supplies, watershed protection land, aquifers and the Parker River and its tributaries.

The Site Plan set, and supporting documents including reports, data and materials submitted and presented during the course of the hearing demonstrate reasonable fulfillment of the Site Plan Review objectives (Section 165-83.P):

(1) Legal: conformance with the provisions of the applicable Bylaws of the Town, the General Laws of Massachusetts, and all applicable rules and regulations of state and federal agencies.

(2) Traffic.

(3) Parking.

(4) Town services.

(5) Pollution control.

(6) Nuisance.

(7) Existing vegetation.

(8) Landscaping, screening and buffering.

(9) Town character.

(10) Drainage and watershed protection.

The proposed use of the Carleton Drive property by the Applicant for a transfer station providing a viable business and a needed public service to the Town and its residents is a use *permitted* by Special Permit issued by the Georgetown Board of Appeals. The issue before the Planning Board is an administrative Site Plan Review under Section 165-83 relative to the previously permitted transfer station use. We request that the Planning Board take favorable action on the pending Site Plan Approval application and grant Site Plan Approval for the G. Mello Disposal Corp. transfer station project on Carleton Drive.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,



Nancy A.S. McCann, Esq.
Attorney for G. Mello Disposal Corp.

NASM/kjl
Enclosures

*At the direction of Town Planner John Cashell, in light of the Town Hall closure, we are submitting this response package electronically.



"B"

Ref.: 21008

June 3, 2021

Mr. John Cashell, Town Planner
Town of Georgetown Planning Board
1 Liberty Street
Georgetown, MA 01833

Reg.: Supplemental Traffic Review
G. Mello Transfer Station, Georgetown, MA

Dear John:

Ron Müller & Associates (RMA) is in receipt of the supplemental information submitted by the applicant for the above-referenced project in response to our April 12, 2021 initial review letter. The following additional documents were reviewed as part of our peer review services to the Town of Georgetown:

- May 26, 2021 Response to Peer Review & Planning Board Comments letter from Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI), Inc. to Mr. John Cashell, Town Planner.
- May 29, 2021 Response to Planning Board Comments letter from Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI), Inc. to Mr. John Cashell, Town Planner.

For ease of reading, this letter paraphrases our initial comments where additional information was requested, the applicant's responses, and any additional comments we have at this time.

Comment 2: It was recommended by one of the Planning Board members that daily traffic counts be collected on Carleton Drive to obtain existing traffic volumes.

Traffic counts on Carleton Drive were collected via an automatic traffic recorder on Friday, March 19, 2021 to Thursday, March 25, 2021 to obtain a full week of count data. The updated May 26, 2021 letter provided seasonal and COVID-19 adjustments to this count data. Based on MassDOT historic traffic counts, traffic during the month of March within the area is typically 10.8 percent lower than

average-month conditions. Therefore, the March counts were upwardly adjusted by 10.8 percent to represent average month conditions.

Additionally, given the current traffic conditions associated with the coronavirus pandemic, the seasonally adjusted counts previously collected in February 2019 were compared to the seasonally adjusted March 2021 counts to determine if the counts collected needed to be adjusted to represent normal, pre-pandemic traffic conditions. It was found that traffic volumes during the weekday AM peak period were higher in March 2021 than in February 2019 and the weekday PM and Saturday midday peak hour volumes were lower in March 2021 than in February 2019. On average the March 2021 counts were 28.8 percent lower than the February 2019 counts and the counts were upwardly adjusted to reflect this. The adjusted traffic volumes are shown in Table 1 of the May 26, 2021 response letter. The resulting volumes appear reasonable and, if anything, are higher than the counts collected prior to the coronavirus pandemic.

Comment 10: We requested information regarding the distribution of site traffic throughout the day. The counts collected at the Casella Waste facility on Hardscrabble Road in Auburn, MA show that the peak traffic times typically occur between 11:00 AM and 2:00 PM. These hours are outside of the peak travel hours on the adjacent streets (7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM).

We also recommended that the proponent count traffic at a similar operating facility to verify the projections. The resulting traffic counts should be classified by vehicle type and compared with the tonnage of waste processed on that day to develop trip-generation rates that can be applied to the proposed project. The results should be compared with the estimates made in the traffic study.

The proponent collected traffic counts at two existing transfer facilities: the Casella Waste facility on Hardscrabble Road in Auburn, MA and the Covanta Semass facility on Cranberry Highway in Wareham, MA. The Auburn facility has the capacity to process 650 tons per day while the Wareham facility has the capacity to process 1,200 tons per day. The volume of waste processed on each day at each facility was obtained to properly estimate trip generation rates to be applied to the proposed Georgetown facility.

It was noted by a board member and in the supplemental May 29, 2021 letter that the Covanta Semass facility in Wareham, MA might not provide a good trip generation comparison to the Georgetown facility. This is because the Wareham facility incinerates material on site and also has waste transported via rail. Additionally, a large volume of traffic currently accesses the facility via the employee entrance, suggesting that the rail and incineration facility operates on a larger scale than what was previously assumed. As such, the Semass facility was

discounted as a comparable facility and the trip generation rates from the peak operating day at the Auburn facility (March 18, 2021, when the facility processed 490 tons) were utilized as a comparison to what was previously assumed in the Updated TIA.

Although the Auburn facility does provide a better comparison to the Georgetown facility than the Wareham facility, a number of differences between the two sites still exist. These differences were accounted for in the trip generation estimates. The Auburn facility does not accept yard waste, however since the residential operation at the proposed site is not planned to be expanded, the trip generation estimates utilized the volume of residential vehicles currently accessing the existing Georgetown transfer facility. Given the proximity of the proposed site to the existing site, this assumption seems reasonable. As shown in Table 1 of the May 29, 2021 letter, the trips assumed in the Updated TIA are comparable to the trip generation assumptions derived from the empirical data.

The May 29, 2021 letter does supply information regarding the predictability of the total volume of vehicles and vehicle types that would be expected to utilize the site. It was reiterated that residential volumes are not expected to increase which is why the estimates utilize the same volume of residential traffic that was counted at the existing Georgetown transfer facility. The existing Georgetown residential counts were collected on a peak operating day in the spring, which represents a “worst case scenario”. Additionally, any employee traffic was estimated based on data regarding number of employees and employee shift schedules. The number of transfer trailers was derived given the capacity of the trucks and the maximum processing capability of the site. As stated in the letter, the transfer trailers can haul 25 tons of material and given a processing capacity of 500 tons, 20 transfer trailers would be required.

Packer trucks would only arrive to the site if they were under contract with G. Mello, as such only 10 trucks are expected per day. It is expected that any material arriving at the site on small commercial vehicles will be similar to the volume that is currently accessing the existing facility. The counts show that 38 small commercial vehicles access the site, GPI’s estimates increased this number by 30 percent to 50 small commercial vehicles. This estimate is comparable to the number of small commercial vehicles counted at the Auburn facility.

Lastly it was mentioned that the least predictable vehicle accessing the site would be roll-off containers, some are contracted while others are not. The Auburn facility shows a much higher volume of packer trucks vs. roll-off container trucks whereas the reverse is expected at the new Georgetown facility. This is due to the fact that the new Georgetown facility will accept more construction and demolition debris than the Auburn facility does. While this is another difference

between Auburn and Georgetown, it is important to note that no two transfer stations are exactly alike and GPI's methodology equating the two sites appears reasonable.

These trip generation estimates seem reasonable given the comparison to the empirical data collected at the Auburn facility. It should further be noted that these estimates assume the proposed facility is operating at full capacity. This will only be the case on peak days in the spring. As mentioned in the May 29, 2021 letter the facility will most often not be operating at or near capacity.

Comment 18: It was reiterated that traffic counts at a comparable transfer facility be collected as described in Comment 10 to verify the trip generation estimates.

See response to Comment 10.

Comment 22: It was mentioned that based on truck turning movements that the arrival times of larger trucks should be scheduled outside of peak hours as well as school hours to minimize conflicts with vehicles exiting Carleton Drive or school bus pick-up/drop-off times. The Town of Georgetown should continue to consider this a condition of any approval of the project.

Comment 24: To determine the ability of Carleton Drive to handle additional truck traffic, it was recommended that a minimum of two pavement cores be taken along Carleton Drive. The pavement cores should be used to analyze the existing pavement thickness and sub-base material which would in turn be used to establish the load-carrying capacity of the road.

GPI retained Miller Engineering & Testing, Inc. to conduct pavement cores along Carleton Drive. A total of 11 pavement cores were collected at spacings of approximately 150 feet on alternating sides of the roadway. The findings show that the existing base and sub-base course soils are unsuitable to support the anticipated loads and intensities associated with the proposed development. It was recommended that Carleton Drive undergo a full depth reconstruction. **The proponent should confirm whether this improvement will be undertaken as part of the project.**

Mr. John Cashell
June 3 2021
Page 5 of 5

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this review.

Sincerely,

Ron Müller & Associates

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kirsten Braun". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kirsten" and last name "Braun" clearly distinguishable.

Kirsten Braun, P.E.
Associate